REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge that Claims 13, 35 and 36 have been allowed and that Claims 23-25 and 39 have been rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claims 31-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Claim 31 does not omit essential elements for the invention claimed therein. In this regard, Claim 31 provides that adjustment of the optical path created by the laser source, the diffractive element and the reflective element causes the light to laser at a selected wavelength. The means by which the optical path is adjusted in Claim 31 is not an essential element of the invention of Claim 31 and thus need not be included in such claim. Rather, the essential elements of the invention of Claim 31 are a collimating lens disposed between the laser source and the diffractive element and a microactuator coupled to the collimating lens for moving the collimating lens to enhance the return of the light to the laser source With this explanation, it is assumed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, will be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10, 14, 15, 18, 28-30, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,365) in view of McIntyre (U.S. Patent No. 5,319,257). Claims 11 and 12 have been similarly rejected over Wu et al. in view of McIntyre, as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Jerman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,998,906), while Claims 16, 17 and 19-22 have been similarly rejected over Wu et al. in view of McIntyre as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Mattori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,539) and Claims 26 and 27 have been similarly rejected over Wu et al. in view of McIntyre as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Broutin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,757). Reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Wu et al. disclose an apparatus for passively stabilizing the optical pathlength in tunable lasers. FIG. 3 thereof is an isometric view of a hardware embodiment of a signal generator 250 having a base 300, fiber mount 302, fiber coupling 304, motor bracket 310, laser diode housing 330, diffraction grating 340, grating mount 342, retroreflector 350, compensating element 352, pivot bracket 354, actuator 370, drive train 376 and start condition sensors 390-392. Col. 6, lines 37-43. In an embodiment of the invention, the actuator is a rotary stepper motor. Other actuators may be used with equal advantage, including, but not limited to: linear stepper motors, piezo-electric stacks, bimetallic elements, AC/DC motors, etc. Col. 7, lines 15-19. The actuator

370 is coupled to the base 300 via motor bracket 310 and strap 440. The individual components of the drive train 376 are visible and include: drive shaft 400, hub and rim 402-404, rotary flex member 406, compensating element 410, translation unit 412, cylindrical nut 414, lead screw 418, and linear flex member 420. The drive train 376 comprises rotary, linear, and arcuate portions. Generally the drive shaft converts the rotary motion of shaft 400 to linear movement of compensating block 410 and finally to arcuate movement of the tip 430 of the pivot arm to which the bracket 354 and associated retroreflector 350 are attached (See FIG. 5). This provides for the tuning of the output beam of the laser. Col. 7; lines 34-47. Where the accuracy of the linear start condition sensor alone is insufficient to indicate a unique starting condition, the rotary start condition sensor 392 may be used in combination with the linear sensor. Col. 12, lines 4-7. In still another embodiment of the invention, microswitches, capacitative sensors inductive sensors, magnetic read switches, etc. could be utilized to signal the start condition. Col. 12, lines 31-34.

McIntyre discloses a uniaxial drive system or microactuator capable of operating in an ultra-high vacuum environment. The uniaxial constant velocity microactuator 10 is shown in FIG. 1 with an axially movable cylindrical shaft 11 therethrough. The microactuator moves the shaft 11 in nanometer increments along the direction of the shaft's rotational axis. The microactuator 10 consists of a single rectangularly-shaped housing member 12 comprising two axial end portions 13, 15, and an axial center portion 14; the portions 13-15 being arranged along the shaft 11 axis. The end portion 13 of housing 12 contains a clamp/pusher assembly 16 therewithin behind an end cap 26, and has a number of vertical lateral flexures 22 spaced about its exterior. In similar manner, end portion 15 of housing 12 contains a clamp/pusher assembly 17 therewithin behind a similar end cap 27 (shown in FIG. 2), and has a number of horizontal lateral flexures 23 spaced about its exterior. Col. 2, line 61 through Col. 3, line 8. Clamp/pusher assembly 16 includes a clamper piezoelectric 60 and a pusher piezoelectric 61 (FIG. 2) that are energized through electrical leads 18, 19, respectively. Similarly, electrical leads 20, 21 are used to power a clamper piezoelectric 70 and a pusher piezoelectric 71 in the clamp/pusher assembly 17. Col. 3, lines 18-24. Once a clamper pad 32, clamper piezoelectric 60, lower and upper clamp holders 37, 38, and clamper lid 39 have been assembled on a clamper frame 36, spacer rings 42, 43 are connected to both sides of the clamper frame 36. The spacer rings 42, 43 serve to stand off two large flexure rings 44, 45 from the clamper frame 36. The large flexure rings 44, 45 guide the shaft-axial motion of the clamp/pusher assembly 16 once it is fixed in place in the recess 30 in housing 12. The spacer rings 42, 43 and large flexure rings 44, 45 are held to the clamper frame 36 by a locking ring 46 screwed into one side of frame 36, and a locking ring/pusher housing 47 on the other. Col. 4, line 60 through Col. 5, line 16. The pusher piezoelectric 61 is press fit into housing 47 by means of a set of three sheet metal leaf springs 48. The leaf springs 48 help to axially align and fix the position of pusher piezoelectric 61 in housing

47, but do not hinder the operation of pusher piezoelectric 61 once assembled. Col. 5, lines 20-25. In the prototype, shaft 11 is superinvar, for example, for its very low thermal coefficient of expansion. Aluminum oxide clamper pads 32 on a superinvar shaft 11 act as a very clean solid bearing system. Col. 7, lines 39-43. The other materials of construction may include aluminum, stainless steel and piezoelectric ceramic. The piezoelectric material may be lead zirconate titanate, for example. Col. 7, lines 51-54. FIG. 7 compares a typical output profile for the commercially available Burleigh Inchworm stepper motor with the microactuator of McIntyre. Col. 5, lines 62-64.

Claim 1, is patentable by calling for a single mode tunable laser operable over a range of wavelengths of the type set forth therein having, among other things, at least one microactuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element for causing angular movement of such element to permit selection of the single wavelength of the light from the range of wavelengths.

In rejecting Claim 1 over Wu et al., the Examiner acknowledges that Wu et al. disclose a tunable laser in a Littman-Metcalf configuration, whose structural arrangement and operation is well known in the art, but is silent as to the use of a microactuator, which implies small in size. The Examiner further states that McIntyre discloses a microactuator used for positioning in nanometer increments, and suggests replacing a stepper motor with a microactuator due to the smooth and continuous motion.

A proper analysis of the obviousness/nonobviousness of the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) requires consideration of two factors: (1) whether the prior art would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art that they should carry out the claimed invention; and (2) whether the prior art would also have revealed that in so carrying out the claimed invention, those of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation of success. Both the suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure. In re Sernaker, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1, at 5 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438, 1442 (CAFC 1991).

In the present case, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is in error because Wu et al. fail to provide the requisite suggestion/motivation to provide a laser system of the type called for therein having, among other things, at least one microactuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element. The Examiner acknowledges that Wu et al. fail to disclose a microactuator. In addition, however, Wu et al. fail to disclose that the apparatus therein could be scaled down in size so as to utilize a microactuator of the type called for in Claim 1. A change in scale of a system imposes restrictions on the design of such a system. Conventional systems cannot be arbitrarily shrunk in size and be expected to work in an

analogous manner. Making systems on a micro scale typically requires novel solutions to conventional engineering problems, none of which are suggested or disclosed by Wu et al.

Similarly, McIntyre does not provide the requisite motivation to add at least one microactuator to a tunable laser of the type disclosed in Wu et al. In this regard, McIntyre does not disclose or even discuss a laser system. Rather, McIntyre merely discloses an actuator capable of moving a shaft in nanometer increments along the direction of the shaft's rotational axis. More specifically, the actuator of McIntyre was developed to fulfill the positioning requirements of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Molecular Measuring Machine. See Col. 1, lines 21-25. McIntyre states that the actuator thereof was developed to provide ultra-precise scanning and indexing in a remote environment, and further states that highly accurate, repeatable positioning in the sub-manometer regime is a necessity when performing dimensional metrology. McIntyre adds that his microactuator is ideally suited for positioning or scanning a myriad of atomic resolution microscopes as well as many other sensors or transducers See Col. 6, lines 35-43. As can be seen, there is no disclosure by McIntyre that his actuator would be suitable for use with a tunable laser or with the components of any other optical system. If relevant at all, McIntyre's discussion of an atomic resolution microscope implies that his actuator moves the whole microscope, not components thereof.

Although the Examiner states that a microactuator implies an actuator that is small in size, McIntyre does not disclose such a microactuator. Hence, Applicant submits that McIntyre further fails to provide the requisite motivation to add at least one microactuator to a tunable laser of the type disclosed in Wu et al. Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Unabridged) agrees with the Examiner and defines the adjective "micro" as meaning "small or minute in size." Applicant's microactuator is indeed "small or minute in size." In this regard, Applicant states on Page 20 beginning at line 12 of the application with respect to FIGS. 10-11:

> The components of tunable laser 501 are carried by a mounting block 511. The laser source 502 is secured to one end of a laser submount block 512 which, in turn, is secured to the top of a laser spacer block 513 attached to one corner of mounting block 511. The second microactuator 508 is secured to the mounting block 511 by means of a lens submount 514, that is attached to the block 511 next to the laser spacer block 513 and at one end of the mounting block 511. The collimating lens 503 is secured to microactuator 508 by a lens substrate or block 515. A mirror actuator submount block 516 is secured to the central portion of the mounting block 511 next to the laser spacer block 513. The first microactuator 507 is adhered to the top of one end of lens actuator submount 516. The diffraction grating 504 extends alongside lens actuator submount 516 and is secured directly to mounting block 511. The mounting block 511, the laser submount 512, the laser spacer block 513, the lens submount 514 and the lens actuator submount 516 are each made from any suitable material such as ceramic. *As shown, tunable laser 501 has a length ranging from five to 25 millimeters and preferably approximately 12 millimeters, a width ranging from four to 15 millimeters and preferably*

> *approximately seven millimeters and a height ranging from three to ten millimeters and preferably approximately six millimeters* (emphasis added).

As so noted in the application, the largest disclosed dimensions of the tunable laser 501 shown in FIGS. 10-11, which includes first and second microactuators 507 and 508 (the first microactuator 507 being mounted on a larger submount block 516, the block 516 being mounted on an even larger mounting block 511), is 25 millimeters by 15 millimeters (0.98 inch by 0.59 inch) while the preferred range of the tunable laser is 12 millimeters by seven millimeters (0.47 inch by 0.28 inch). As can be seen from FIGS. 10 and 11, the microactuators 507 and 508 of tunable laser 501 are considerably smaller than these dimensions. In this regard, for example, the dimensions of the first and second comb drive assemblies 527 and 528 of microactuator 507, illustrated in FIG. 12, are disclosed on Page 22 of the application beginning at line 18:

> Each of the first and second comb drive assemblies 527 and 528 has a length ranging from 300 to 3000 microns and preferably approximately 1300 microns, and commences a radial distance from the pivot point of microactuator 507 ranging from 500 to 5000 microns and preferably approximately 2000 microns.

As so noted in the application, the largest length of comb drive assemblies 527 and 528 is 3000 microns or 0.12 inch and the preferred length of the comb drive assemblies is 1300 microns or 0.05 inch.

In contrast, the microactuator disclosed in McIntyre is significantly larger than the microactuator called for in Claim 1. For example, McIntyre compares a typical output profile for the commercially available Burleigh Inchworm stepper motor with his microactuator. Burleigh has been purchased by EXFO. As can be seen from the dimensions set forth on Page 2 of the attached brochure of EXFO Burleigh Products Group Inc. entitled *INCHWORM* Motors, the smallest EXFO Burleigh Inchworm stepper motor appears to have a length of slightly more than 84.90 millimeters (84900 microns or 3.54 inches) and a diameter of 25.1 millimeters (25100 microns or 0.99 inch). When configured with a rotations stage (RS-800), such smallest motor appears to have a length of 125.2 millimeters (125200 microns or 5.41 inches) and a diameter of 1.49 inch. Further, as disclosed and illustrated in McIntyre, and as noted above, the actuator in FIG. 3 of McIntyre appears to utilize conventional screw heads, which suggests that the diameter of such McIntyre actuator would be on the order of one inch. It thus appears that in fact the actuator of McIntyre ranges from one to two orders of magnitude greater in size than the microactuator called for in Claim 1.

Even if an actuator of McIntyre, or in fact a microactuator of the type disclosed by Applicant, is combined with an apparatus of the type disclosed in Wu et al., there is no suggestion or disclosure in the prior art that in so carrying out such combination those of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation of success. As can be appreciated by those skilled in the art, the field of microactuator design is still nascent. Contrary to the belief of the

Examiner, it cannot be assumed that any particular actuator configuration can be developed or is physically possible. Hence, there is no reasonable expectation that the inclusion of at least one microactuator of the type called for in Claim 1 in an apparatus such as disclosed in Wu et al. would be successful in producing a tunable single mode laser, let alone a tunable single mode laser as called for in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 as being obvious over Wu et al. in view of McIntyre is improper and should be withdrawn. Claim 1 should be found allowable.

Claims 2-12 and 14-27 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein. For example, Claim 9 is additionally patentable by providing that the at least one microactuator includes a first microactuator coupled to the reflective element for rotating the reflective element about a pivot point and a second microactuator coupled to the reflective element for translating the reflective element relative to the diffractive element The additional limitations of Claim 9 are not suggested or disclosed by the prior art.

Claim 11 is additionally patentable by providing that the at least one microactuator is an electrostatic microactuator having interdigitatable comb fingers. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, there is no suggestion or disclosure in Jerman et al. that an electrostatic microactuator having interdigitable comb fingers as disclosed therein would be suitable for use in a relatively large piezoelectric driven actuator of the type disclosed in McIntyre, let alone in a tunable laser of the type called for in Claim 1. In this regard, an actuator with interdigitable comb fingers is electrostatically driven, while the actuator of McIntyre is piezoelectrically driven. Such principles of operation are quite different and do not permit, as appears to be suggested by the Examiner, a comb driven actuator to be substituted into a piezoelectric actuator to provide a workable device. There is further no suggestion in Jerman et al. that the microactuator thereof would be suitable for use in a tunable laser, particularly of the type called for in Claim 1.

Claim 28 is patentable by calling for a tunable laser comprising a laser source for providing light with a wavelength selected from a range of wavelengths, a diffractive element spaced from the laser source for redirecting the light received from the laser source, a reflective element spaced from the diffractive element for receiving the light redirected by the diffractive element and for further redirecting the light back to the diffractive element, the diffractive element receiving the light further redirected by the reflective element and returning the light to the laser source whereby the laser source, the diffractive element and the reflective element cause the light to lase at the wavelength, and a rotatable micromechanical actuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element for rotating such element to select the wavelength of the light.

The rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is in error because, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Wu et al. fail to provide the requisite suggestion/motivation to provide a laser system of the type called for therein having, among other things, at least one microactuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element and McIntyre does not provide the requisite motivation to add an actuator to a laser system, let alone a microactuator of the type called for in Claim 28 to a laser system of the type disclosed in Wu et al. Even if Wu et al. and McIntyre are combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, neither Wu et al. nor McIntyre suggests or discloses a rotatable micromechanical actuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element for rotating such element to select the wavelength of the light. In this regard, neither Wu et al. nor McIntyre disclose a microactuator of the type called for in Claim 1, nor do such references disclose a micromechanical actuator or a rotatable micromechanical actuator.

Claims 29-30 depend from Claim 28 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 28 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein. For example, Claim 29 is additionally patentable by stating that the micromechanical actuator includes a rotatable micromechanical actuator coupled to one of the diffractive element and the reflective element for rotating and translating such element. Neither Wu et al. nor McIntyre suggest or disclose an actuator, including a rotatable micromechanical actuator, for rotating and translating one of the diffractive element and the reflective element. Claim 30 is additionally patentable by calling for an additional microactuator coupled to such element for translating such element.

Claim 37 is patentable by calling for a tunable laser of the type called for therein having, among other things, a rotatable electrostatic microactuator coupled to the reflective element for rotating the reflective element about a pivot point spaced apart from the microactuator to select the wavelength of the light. Neither Wu et al. nor McIntyre suggest or disclose a microactuator of the type called for in Claim 37 or such a microactuator coupled to the reflective element for rotating the reflective element. Such references also do not disclose an electrostatic microactuator, let alone a rotatable electrostatic microactuator. In addition to the foregoing, neither Wu et al. nor McIntyre suggest or disclose a rotatable microactuator coupled to the reflective element for rotating the reflective element about a pivot point spaced apart from the microactuator.

Claims 38-39 depend from Claim 37 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 37 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of record are allowable and that the application should be passed to issue. Should the Examiner believe that the application is not in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would help further prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

By

Edward N. Bachand, Reg. No. 37,085

Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187
Telephone: 650-494-8700

1066983